APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,587	03/01/2002	Samir G. Lehaff	00680.P0021	3924

21971   7590   02/09/2006

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 PAGE MILL ROAD
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1050

EXAMINER
HOSSAIN, TANIM M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 December 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-147</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-147</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 9-15, 17-22, 25-33, 36, 37, 39, 40, 46-49, 50-51, 58-64, 66-72, 74-83, 85-89,

91-93, 95-103, 106-112, 114-119, 122-130, 132-134, 136, 137, and 140-147 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Rajarajan (U.S. 6,950,990) in view of Elsey (U.S.

2004/0258231).

As per claim 1, Rajarajan teaches a communication server (column 5, lines 12-32); a

corporate information system coupled to the server through a network, the CIS including storage

for corporate information including emails, and servers including an email server (column 5,

lines 12-32; column 10, lines 15-36); logic that stores, in the CIS, a user profile with all user-

related information for use with the communication server (column 5, lines 12-32); logic that

caches the user related information from the CIS on the communication server (figure 1); and

logic that performs administration on the user-related information only on the user-related

information stored on the CIS (Figure 18). Rajarajan does not specifically teach the server being

coupled to speech terminals, which are used to access the data in the CIS. Elsey teaches the use

of speech terminals to access a company-wide database, with employee information stored in a server (paragraphs 0038, 0039, 0057). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ability of accessing employee records kept in a storage system, coupled to a communication server, through the use of speech terminals, as taught by Elsey in the system of Rajarajan to arrive at the claimed communication system disposed to access employee records. The motivation for doing so lies in the fact that allowing for speech communication in accessing records would allow for further versatility of Rajarajan's invention, in the case that a prospective user does not have access to a computer terminal, for example, and thus may access the information through their telephone. Both inventions are from the same field of endeavor, namely the remote accessing of employee data through a network.

As per claim 2, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the voice signals are recognized through speech recognition technology (Elsey: 0051).

As per claim 3, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the server is a modular appliance (Elsey: figures 1 and 2).

As per claim 9, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the speech terminals are attended devices (Elsey: 0008).

As per claim 10, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the speech terminals are unattended device (Elsey: 0008).

As per claim 11, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein a user accesses one or more parties through a speech terminal using the e-mail address, phone number, or any other form of identification for the one or more parties stored in the CIS (Elsey: 0117).

As per claim 12, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the server dynamically associates a user with a speech terminal using data stored in the CIS, the association created when the user logs on to the mobile communication system with a speech terminal (Elsey: 0107, 0058).

As per claim 13, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 12, wherein the CIS stores the association between the user and the speech terminal as a user profile, the CIS accessing the user profile every time the user logs on to the mobile communication system using the speech terminal (Elsey: 0059).

As per claim 14, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein user authentication is required to access the data in the CIS (Elsey: 0059).

As per claim 15, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 14, wherein the authentication comprises a code (Elsey: 0058).

As per claim 17, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the data in the CIS includes contact information (Elsey: 0008).

As per claim 18, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the data in the CIS includes e-mail messages (Elsey: 0040).

As per claim 19, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the data in the CIS includes address information (Elsey: 0054, 0063).

As per claim 20, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the data in the CIS includes calendar and task lists (Elsey: 0098, 0011).

As per claim 21, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the data in the CIS includes directory lists (Elsey: Abstract, 0004).

As per claim 22, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the data in the CIS includes customer relationship management information (Elsey: 0042).

As per claim 25, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the data in the CIS includes information related to an organization's employees (Elsey: 0042).

As per claim 26, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 25, wherein the data in the CIS includes information related to an organization's employees (Elsey: 0042).

As per claim 27, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 25, wherein the data in the CIS includes information from data repositories external to the organization (Elsey: 0008).

As per claim 28, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the data in the CIS includes information from databases and web sites on the Internet (Elsey: 0043).

As per claim 29, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the speech terminals are configured to allow a user to access and update the data in the CIS through the speech terminals (Elsey: 0043).

As per claim 30, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 29, wherein the data in the CIS is accessible to the user and other users registered in the CIS (Elsey: 0042).

As per claim 31, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the server is configured to allow a user to perform tasks using the CIS (Elsey: 0049).

As per claim 32, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 31, wherein the tasks include sending and receiving messages (Elsey: 0049).

As per claim 33, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication of claim 32, wherein the messages are e-mail messages (Elsey: Abstract, 0049).

As per claim 36, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein a set of responses to a user changes dynamically depending on the needs of the user (Elsey: 0013).

As per claim 37, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 36, wherein the set of responses to the user includes a recorded message (Elsey: 0051).

As per claim 39, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the speech terminals include multi-modal interfaces (Elsey: Abstract, 0003).

As per claim 40, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 38, wherein the user can input information to the server through the multi-modal interfaces uses text, keystrokes, and speech recognition (Elsey: 0051, 0081).

As per claim 46, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the speech terminals include telephones (Elsey: 0046).

As per claim 47, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the speech terminals include personal digital assistants (Elsey: 0003).

As per claim 48, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the speech terminals include computers (Elsey: 0081).

As per claim 49, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, wherein the network is the Internet (Elsey: 0048).

As per claim 50, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches a server for a mobile communications network having speech terminals, the server comprising: means for interfacing to a telecommunications system for speech communication (Elsey: 0051, 0008); means for receiving and caching from a CIS, user-related information which is stored on the CIS and for which administration is performed only on the CIS, wherein the CIS includes storage for corporation information including emails, and servers including an email server (Rajarajan: column 5, lines 12-32; column 10, lines 15-36); means for distributing incoming and outgoing calls from the speech terminals (Elsey: 0051, 0008); and means for accessing data in the CIS through voice or other signals received from the speech terminals through the telecommunications network (Elsey: 0051, 0008).

Claims 51, 58-64, 66-72, 74-83, 85-89, 91-93, 95-103, 106-112, 114-119, 122-130, 132-134, 136, 137, and 140-147 are rejected on the same basis as the preceding claims.

Claims 4-8, 23, 24, 35, 41, 45, 53-57, 72, 73, 84, 90, 94, 101-105, 120, 121, and 138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajarajan-Elsey in view of Hackbarth (U.S. 2002/0143877).

As per claim 4, Rajarajan-Elsey teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, but does not specifically teach inclusion of public and private telecommunication networks into the system. Hackbarth teaches the communication between public and private networks (0020). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the use of public and

private networks as taught by Hackbarth in the system of Rajarajan-Elsey. The motivation for doing so lies in the fact that allowing for use in multiple network types would allow for extensibility of Rajarajan-Elsey's invention. All inventions are also from the same field of endeavor, namely the efficient network communication between users.

As per claim 5, Rajarajan-Elsey-Hackbarth teaches the mobile communication system of claim 4, wherein the server is configured to distribute incoming calls from the public communications network to the private communications network (Hackbarth: 0031, 0044).

As per claim 6, Rajarajan-Elsey-Hackbarth teaches the mobile communication system of claim 4, wherein the server is configured to distribute outgoing calls from the private communications network to the public communications network (Hackbarth: 0031, 0044).

As per claim 7, Rajarajan-Elsey-Hackbarth teaches the mobile communication system of claim 4, wherein the server is configured to distribute incoming and outgoing calls to the private communications network (Hackbarth: 0031, 0044).

As per claim 8, Rajarajan-Elsey-Hackbarth teaches the mobile communication system of claim 4, wherein the server is configured to distribute incoming and outgoing calls to the public communications network (Hackbarth: 0031, 0044).

As per claims 23 and 24, Rajarajan-Elsey-Hackbarth teaches the mobile communication system of claim 1, but does not specifically include FFA and SFA into the data repository. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these items specifically, as these components are specific characteristics of a certain company. Since company profiles and characteristics are already taught to be included in the CIS by Elsey-Hackbarth, it would have been obvious to add these components.

As per claim 35, Rajarajan-Elsey-Hackbarth teaches the mobile communication system of claim 31, wherein the tasks include conferencing with other parties registered in the CIS (Hackbarth: 0003).

As per claim 41, Rajarajan-Elsey-Hackbarth teaches the mobile communication system of claim 38, wherein the multi-modal interfaces present information to the server using a combination of sound, text, graphics, and video (Hackbarth: 0090, 0039).

As per claim 45, Rajarajan-Elsey-Hackbarth teaches the mobile communication system of claim 41, wherein the video is generated by a continuous stream of video data sent to the multi-modal interfaces (Hackbarth: 0090, 0039).

Claims 53-57, 72, 73, 84, 90, 94, 101-105, 120, 121, and 138 are rejected on the same bases as the preceding claims.

Claims 16, 38, 42, 65, 113, 131, 135, and 139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajarajan-Elsey-Hackbarth in view of Elliot (U.S. 2002/0064149).

As per claim 16, Rajarajan-Elsey-Hackbarth teaches the mobile communication system of claim 14, but does not specifically teach the authentication matching a voice characteristic. Elliot teaches voice authentication (1276). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a voice authentication procedure as taught by Elliot in the system of Rajarajan-Elsey-Hackbarth. The motivation for doing so lies in the fact that having a voice authentication procedure would enable those who cannot type to be authenticated. All inventions are from the same field of endeavor, namely the efficient communication through a network.

As per claim 38, Rajarajan-Elsey-Hackbarth-Elliot teaches the mobile communication system of claim 36, wherein the set of responses to the user is an on-the-fly translation of responses into sounds using text-to-speech technology (Elliot: 1604).

As per claim 42, Rajarajan-Elsey-Hackbarth-Elliot teaches the mobile communication system of claim 41, wherein the mobile communication system of claim 41, wherein the sound is generated by text-to-speech technology (Elliot: 1604).

Claims 65, 113, 131, 135, and 139 are rejected on the same basis as the preceding claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on December 1, 2005 have fully been considered and are respectfully traversed by the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Tanim Hossain whose telephone number is 571/272-3881. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571/272-3933. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tanim Hossain
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145

JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER